

REMARKS

The Office has improperly rejected Claims 1-27 as being unpatentable over Fischer et al. in view of Stilp, et al. (incorrectly identified in the Office Action as “Stilp et al.”)

Claims 1, 9, 18 and 23 recite *inter alia*:

(Claim 1) “monitoring at the wireless location sensors a signal on **a forward channel** between one of the plurality of base stations and the mobile appliance; retrieving at said wireless location sensors synchronization information from **the forward channel**”

(Claim 9) “monitoring a signal in **the forward channel** to the mobile appliance; retrieving synchronization information from **the forward channel** signal”

(Claim 18) “monitoring a signal on **a forward channel** between one of said plurality of base stations and the mobile appliance; retrieving synchronization information from said **forward channel**”

(Claim 23) “monitoring **the forward channel** for synchronization information and tuning the plurality of sensors to the reverse channel with the synchronization information”

The forward channel, as recited in the above claims and as known in the art, is the downlink channel, not the reverse or uplink channel that the Office has used improperly in applying Fischer.

The Office most incorrectly states that “Fischer teaches...monitoring at the wireless location sensors a signal on a forward channel...receiving said wireless location sensors synchronization information from the forward channel” as cites col. 5, ll. 38-45, col. 8, ll. 25-31., col. 10, ll. 38-57.

All of the cited passages refer to the reverse or uplink channel, **not the forward channel** as required in the claims.

The addition of Stilp does not obviate the deficiencies of Fischer.

The Office Action has failed to provide a teaching of at least the above claim features and thus has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

Likewise as the remaining claims all depend from Claims 1, 9, 18 and 23, their rejection is also improper irrespective of the additional patentable features recited therein.

The rejections of Claim 1-27 must be withdrawn.

In addition, the Office fails to appreciate that the claimed method monitors the forward channel to obtain synchronization data for the reverse channel by which to generate a geolocation estimate. Neither Fischer nor Stilp disclose monitoring the downlink for synchronization data.

Conclusion

In no manner can Stilp and Fischer alone or in combination render the claims unpatentable as discussed above. All of the pending claims contain allowable subject matter as indicated by the Office or depend from claims containing allowable subject matter. The application is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephonic or in-person interview would advance the prosecution of the Application.

While additional extension fees are not deemed necessary at this time, the Office is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate extension fee to Deposit Account No. 04-1679, Duane Morris LLP.

Respectfully submitted,

/mcc/

Mark C. Comtois

Reg. No. 46,285

DUANE MORRIS LLP
505 9th Street, N.W., Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: (202) 776-7800
Telecopier: (202) 776-7801

Dated: March 27, 2008